



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/821,267	03/29/2001	Kazutoyo Maehiro	6514-8	4470

7055 7590 09/26/2005

GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.  
1950 ROLAND CLARKE PLACE  
RESTON, VA 20191

EXAMINER

ZHONG, CHAD

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2152

DATE MAILED: 09/26/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action  
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

09/821,267

Applicant(s)

MAEHIRO ET AL.

Examiner

Chad Zhong

Art Unit

2152

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 26 August 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

**AMENDMENTS**

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because

(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);

(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);

(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or

(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.

6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: none.

Claim(s) objected to: none.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-18.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: none.

**AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE**

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER**

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: see continuation sheet.

12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

13. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

*N. S. Hardy*

continuation of item 11:

1. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., example shown in Figs. 5 and 6 of Applicant's specification) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

2. Applicant argued in substance that although Adler extract keywords from original documents, the keywords are not converted to a specific word or phrase on the basis of the second data sets. In fact, Adler does not teach or suggest anything could be considered to read on the claimed second data sets.

In response to Applicant's arguments, the second data set is the result for example, a hard copy scanning or audio speech. The scanned data is initially stored in the scanning device and later sent to the database 310 for storage. The database 310 acts as the second set of data. Furthermore, Adler teaches the conversion in at least two ways. First, refer to Col. 10, lines 40-50, the digital data is in machine language, not understood by humans, there is an inherent machine language to human language conversion prior to displaying the calendar to the human user. Secondly, refer to Col. 14, lines 35 - Col. 15, lines 5, wherein further information on the digital calendar can be linked electronically via a URL link, the conversion of scanned in data takes form into an electronic calendar, the calendar is generated in accordance with the various events and users associated with the event, note that users can select which events to generate and display on each instance of the calendar.

3. Applicant argued in substance that Adler does not disclose storing words or phrases in a first storage device in a first language and storing words or phrases in a second storage device in a second language.

In response to Applicant's arguments, the machine language of devices are different. For instance, as illustrated in Col. 7, lines 35-40, the fax machine's language (bitmap) is different from the machine language of the. This indicates the scanned electronic bit map information is different from the machine language code, thus, this realizes the claimed limitation.

4. Applicant argued in substance that claims 8, 9, 11, and 12 also recites features not shown or suggested by Adler, Adler is not related to returning messages when the words or phrases are entered into a scheduler by an entry system.

In response to Applicant's arguments, Adler teaches of displaying a digital calendar to the user, the information is retrieved from database 310 and displayed to the user, Col. 14, lines 35-67. The information displayed can contain additional hyperlinks to additional information within the database. Upon user interaction for additional contents, the message is returned to the database for retrieval of additional information.